UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

PROVISIONAL

A/46/PV.74
6 January 1992

ENGLISH

Forty-sixth session

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 74th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 16 December 1991, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. FLORES BERMUDEZ (Honduras)
(Vice-President)

- Elimination of racism and racial discrimination [92]

  (a) Report of the Third Committee

  (b) Draft resolution

- Rights of peoples to self-determination [93]: report of the Third Committee

/...

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the General Assembly.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

91-62037 8125V (E)

- Social development [94]

  (a) Questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family: report of the Third Committee (Part I)

- Advancement of women [95]: report of the Third Committee

- Narcotic Drugs [96]: report of the Third Committee

- Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions [97]: report of the Third Committee

In the absence of the President, Mr. Flores Bermudez (Honduras), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 92, 93, 94 (a), 95, 96 and 97

ELIMINATION OF RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

(a) REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/46/718)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/46/L.47)

RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO SELF-DETERMINATION: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/46/719)

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

(a) QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE WORLD SOCIAL SITUATION AND TO YOUTH, AGEING, DISABLED PERSONS AND THE FAMILY: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (PART I) (A/46/704 and Corrs.1 and 2)

ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/46/653)

NARCOTIC DRUGS: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/46/720 and Corr.1)

REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES, QUESTIONS RELATING TO REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS AND HUMANITARIAN QUESTIONS: REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/46/705)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the Rapporteur of the Third Committee, Ms. Rosemary Samafumu of Uganda, to present the reports of the Third Committee.

Ms. SAMAFUMU (Uganda), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour to present the following reports of the Third Committee on the items allocated to it by the General Assembly for consideration.

Under agenda item 92, "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of three draft resolutions in paragraph 16 of its report (A/46/718).

Under agenda item 93, "Right of peoples to self-determination", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of three draft resolutions in paragraph 21 of its report (A/46/719).

(Ms. Semafumu, Rapporteur, Third Committee)

Under agenda item 94 (a), "Social development: questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of seven draft resolutions in paragraph 28 and a draft decision in paragraph 29 of its report (A/46/704 and Corrs.1 and 2).

Under agenda item 95, "Advancement of women", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of four draft resolutions in paragraph 17 and a draft decision in paragraph 18 of its report (A/46/653).

Under agenda item 96, "Narcotic drugs", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of four draft resolutions in paragraph 16 of its report (A/46/720 and Corr.1).

Under agenda item 97, "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions", the Third Committee recommends the adoption of four draft resolutions in paragraph 18 and a draft decision in paragraph 19 of its report (A/46/705).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Third Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote.

The positions of delegations regarding the various recommendations of the Third Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

(The President)

May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401 the General Assembly agreed that

"When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

I remind delegations that, also in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Third Committee, I should like to advise representatives that, unless delegations have already notified the Secretariat otherwise, we shall proceed with the voting in the same manner as was done in the Committee. This means that where recorded votes were taken we shall do the same. I also hope that we can proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Third Committee.

The Assembly will now consider agenda item 92, entitled "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination". In this connection the Assembly has before it the report of the Third Committee (A/46/718), containing three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 16 of the report. The Assembly also has before it a draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.47.

We shall first take a decision on the recommendations contained in the report of the Third Committee. We shall then proceed to consider draft resolution A/46/L.47.

(The President)

The Assembly will now take up the report of the Third Committee contained in document A/46/718 and take a decision on the recommendations contained in paragraph 16 of the report.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination". It was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/83).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution II is entitled "Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution II was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 39 abstentions (resolution 46/84).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution III, entitled "Second Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/85)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will next consider the draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.47.

I call on the representative of the United States of America to introduce the draft resolution.

---

* Subsequently, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.

Mr. EAGLEBURGER (United States of America): The United Nations was founded in 1945 at the close of one of the darkest chapters in recorded history. Two World Wars, the massacre of untold millions and a hideous attempt to exterminate an entire people formed the backdrop to the San Francisco Conference. Mankind's hopes for a different fate in a better future rested almost entirely on the shoulders of the new international body and its potential as a peace-maker and peace-keeper and on its moral authority as a voice for human values. One of the early acts of the United Nations was to assist in the realization of the national aspirations of that people - the Jewish people - who had so recently been the victims of one of the most barbarous acts known to man.

Those hopes for a better future were dashed with the onset of the cold war. The international landscape was divided right down the middle between East and West. The two blocs stood poised on the brink of thermonuclear war. Totalitarian ideologies spread hatred and turned reality on its head by enslaving men and women in the name of liberating them. And in the United Nations, confrontation replaced cooperation, paralysis prevailed over action. Ideological conflict eroded the most precious asset of the United Nations - its claim to impartiality and moral honesty. The great Parliament of mankind had become a forum for sterile rhetoric, feckless name-calling and the wilful distortion of reality.

At no time was this more evident than in 1975, when the General Assembly adopted resolution 3379 (XXX), which included a determination that zionism was a form of racism. This determination demonstrated, like nothing else before or since, to what extent the cold war had distorted the United Nations vision of reality, marginalized its political utility and separated it from its

(Mr. Eagleburger, United States)

original moral purpose. Resolution 3379 (XXX) was one of this body's most ungenerous acts. It branded the national aspirations of one people, and one people only, as illegitimate - a people that had been homeless, dispersed and exiled for the better part of two millenia. It labelled as racist the national aspirations of the one people more victimized by racism than any other.

My Government rejected this characterization of zionism in 1975, and it has hoped for and worked for its revocation ever since. Successive United States administrations of Presidents Ford, Carter, Reagan and now Bush have been supported in this endeavour by our Congress and by our major political parties. And they have been supported overwhelmingly by the people of the United States, who have never understood how the United Nations could let stand such a blatant repudiation of the call contained in the Charter for Member States to practice tolerance and live together as good neighbours. In President Bush's call for repeal before this Assembly last September, he recognized that the United Nations was at a historic watershed. By repealing this resolution unconditionally, he noted, the United Nations will enhance its credibility and serve the cause of peace.

Now the endeavours of 16 long years are about to come to fruition, not because of the United States - although we have never wavered in our determination - but because the era that produced resolution 3379 (XXX) has - thank God - passed into history. With that era have gone many of the dictatorships whose repression was based on systematic lying and the distortion of reality. With that era have gone the confrontational ideologies that held much of the world in their thrall. They have been displaced by a revolution in truth-telling and openness, which is truly universal in scope.

(Mr. Eagleburger, United States)

They have been displaced increasingly by democratic governments committed to the universal human values for which this body, in principle, stands. Indeed, nothing more eloquently demonstrates the passing of the cold war era than the fact that many governments, whose undemocratic predecessors had supported or voted for the original resolution in 1975, have joined now in sponsoring its revocation.

One of the signal features of the new era we have entered is that the United Nations is ever more frequently being asked to play a central role in making peace between nations and regions in conflict, in consolidating that peace through the deployment of military observers and peace-keeping forces and, when it is necessary, as was so recently the case in the Persian Gulf, in leading the world in response to aggression.

We believe that with the world's and this body's passage into a new era, it is more than time to consign one of the last relics of the cold war to the dustbin of history. That is why we are presenting to this General Assembly today, on behalf of 85 co-sponsors, a resolution revoking the determination that zionism is racism. We believe it is time to take this step, thereby recovering for the United Nations its reputation for fairness and impartiality, and reaffirming its commitment to the vision of San Francisco.

Let me emphasize that the resolution we are submitting is aimed at no one, at no State, at no region and at no group. Its sole and simple aim is to right a wrong and to restore the moral authority of this Organization. It is not aimed or linked to the peace process in the Middle East. However, I will say that my Government believes that this action can only help, and not hinder, efforts currently under way to bring peace to that region. For

(Mr. Eagleburger, United States)

16 years, the existence of the "zionism is racism" determination has stood in the way of those who wish to see the United Nations play a more significant role in the peace process. It is simply a fact that resolution 3379 (XXX) contradicted the spirit of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which are the continuing basis for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

Even more significant, however, was the message that resolution 3379 (XXX) sent to the people of Israel. It told them that their national aspirations were inspired by racism. It told them that their national existence was illegitimate. It told them them that the international community in all its solemn majesty had once again subjected the Jewish people to a singular form of persecution.

It is almost a cliché to say that there can be no true peace without confidence - mutual confidence on the part of all sides to a conflict. There can be no peace without the recognition by each side of the other's legitimacy. There can be no true or lasting peace without a spirit of brotherhood.

The resolution we are introducing today would send a different message to the people of Israel from the one this body sent in 1975. But fundamentally, it is not Israel that needs this action. It is the United Nations that requires it. Its passage will vindicate the universal principles upon which this Organization was founded and redeem the hopes that mankind vested in the United Nations at its inception.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call upon the representative of the Lebanon.

Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon): Allow me, on behalf of the Arab Group, over which I have the honour to preside this month, to state our opposition to draft resolution A/46/L.47. The movement by a number of sponsors to revoke General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) of 10 November 1975 cannot be interpreted as a constructive development as long as the problems which led to its adoption obtain.

In fact, the record of the United Nations is replete with evidence of heightened racial discrimination against Palestinians and other populations in the occupied Arab territories. It is the position of the Arab Group that any move by the sponsors to revoke resolution 3379 (XXX) would indicate a lack of studied analysis or objective judgement on their part.

The United States has been working diligently to revoke resolution 3379 (XXX) for many years, so its position came as no surprise. What was not anticipated, however, was that the United States, having worked assiduously to convene the Madrid conference and the ongoing peace process, would sponsor this draft resolution at this point in time.

The timing comes in the wake of an understanding - indeed a clear understanding - that no controversial issues would be raised during the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly that might jeopardize or derail the Middle East peace process. The United States argues that the adoption of this draft resolution would restore to the United Nations an active role in the Arab-Israeli conflict, after the Organization had been deliberately marginalized - if not paralysed - by Israel, during the ongoing peace process. The sponsors of this draft resolution are under the false impression

(Mr. Makkawi, Lebanon)

that its adoption would be an incentive for Israel to be more responsive, if not compliant, with the role and resolutions of the United Nations.

This claim is negated by a record that proves beyond any shadow of doubt that, when Israel is placated, it becomes more defiant rather than compliant; we need only remind this Assembly of Israel's behaviour after the peace treaty with Egypt, and after the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) recognized Israel's right to exist, in December 1988.

These and other peaceful overtures to Israel were pre-empted by acts of blatant intransigence, such as the annexation of East Jerusalem and the Syrian Golan, and the full-scale invasion of Lebanon. Even while United States Secretary of State Baker was seeking to bring the parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to the negotiating table, Israel was establishing more illegal settlements, expanding existing ones and continuing its bombardment of southern Lebanon.

Only four days ago, as a matter of routine defiance, Jewish settlers moved into six homes in Silwan, in occupied Jerusalem, forcibly removing their inhabitants and throwing their belongings into the streets. Such routine and random aggression directed at Arabs is not only racist, but in violation of the spirit and the letter of every relevant resolution of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as of the spirit of the current peace process taking place in Washington DC.

To put it mildly, the adoption of this draft resolution would hinder the peace process. Its approval would not only whet the appetite of Israeli extremists wishing to pursue their policy of creeping annexation; it would also serve to fuel the passions of those Arabs who believe that the whole peace process is an exercise in futility which gives Israel more time to expand and achieve its revisionist Zionist project.

(Mr. Makkawi, Lebanon)

More alarming, perhaps, is that the revocation of resolution 3379 (XXX) would set a dangerous precedent which could render other United Nations resolutions no longer morally and politically binding. A repeal of a General Assembly resolution, in itself, if not achieved through unanimity and by consensus, would carry with it very negative and dangerous implications; it would lead to the undermining of the validity, efficiency and relevance of United Nations resolutions and, for this reason, would be an important issue not only for the future of peace and security in the Middle East, but for the world at large.

If this Assembly chooses to effect a drastic reversal of its earlier judgement as the means to correct an alleged grievance or respond to a new or evolving situation, then it appears in danger of losing its collective memory. Acquiescence in this case would constitute a sort of collective abdication of judgement, inasmuch as resolution 3379 (XXX) has heretofore been denounced, but never rebutted.

The one-sentence draft resolution is presented as "take it or leave it", with no attempt at persuasion through rational discourse. Let me emphasize that the Arab Group at the United Nations is eager to avoid a confrontation on this issue. Our position reflects the Arab States' commitment to a just and comprehensive peace; we are open to alternative options, but the draft resolution was promoted in such a dogmatic manner that it seems to pre-empt any inquiry into the merits of what it seeks to revoke. If successful, the new resolution would serve to insulate Israel from any meaningful accountability for its policies, behaviour, practices, its proclaimed expansionist doctrine and its national purpose.

(Mr. Makkawi, Lebanon)

While the sponsors of the draft resolution affirm that the draft resolution is not directed against any Arab State, it conspicuously glosses over the deep wounds suffered by the Christian and Muslim Palestinians, who have been systematically discriminated against, whether under occupation or denied their right to return to their homeland because of their non-Jewishness. At the same time, their rights to self-determination and return are recognized and reconfirmed, year after year, by this Assembly.

Furthermore, Israel does not consider itself the occupying Power in the occupied territories, but rather the claimant Power; consequently, the status of the Arab population has been reduced to a point where it enjoys limited municipal rights and absolutely no national rights. Is this not, Mr. President, discrimination? Is not forcible, unilateral annexation of Jerusalem and the Golan an act of deliberate disrespect for the national dignity of the Syrian and Palestinian populations there? How should one describe the eviction of people from their homes in order to replace them with Soviet immigrants? Does the anguish of one people justify the infliction of tragedy on another?

At this juncture, it is not the intention of the Arab Group to reopen the Palestine question or to document Israeli trampling on the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) in the south of Lebanon, with all the concomitant abuses to the population. Our purpose is to ensure that the United Nations institutional memory of Israel's practices does not relapse into coma.

(Mr. Makkawi, Lebanon)

To no avail, the Arab Group has demonstrated a willingness to accommodate, adjust and compromise. Our quest is for consistency and we do not seek to be morally patronizing because of a passing diplomatic setback. Rather, we wish to ensure that the sponsors of the draft resolution to revoke resolution 3379 (XXX) do not forget or ignore the escalating discrimination and human-rights violations endured by Arabs under Israeli occupation, whether in the Palestinian territories, including Jerusalem, the Syrian Golan or southern Lebanon.

The sponsors of this draft resolution are taking a gamble if they believe the revocation of resolution 3379 (XXX) will induce Israel to comply with international legality. For decades Israel has defied the Fourth Geneva Convention, the United Nations Charter and scores of relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, and its unparalleled track record confirms that it will continue to do so. We in the Arab Group hope that we are wrong in our assessment.

In closing, let us hope that whichever way the vote goes, the United Nations will more vigorously pursue its responsibility to end the tragedy of the Palestinian people, the sustained suffering of the Syrians in the Golan and the Lebanese in the south of my own country.

If the vote today can embolden the sponsors of draft resolution A/46/L.47 to seek Israel's compliance with outstanding Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 425 (1978), then the Arab Group will revise its assumptions. If the sponsors fail to move to expedite the peace process towards the legitimate rights of all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, then let their consciences carry the burden of their inaction.

(Mr. Makkawi, Lebanon)

In all circumstances, the Arab Group seeks the peace that is currently being worked on in Washington. If it is achieved in a just manner, then the vote today and the resolution that it seeks to revoke will be footnotes in what has been the agonizing history of the Middle East.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Yemen to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen): The draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.47 provides that the General Assembly

"Decides to revoke the determination contained in its resolution 3379 (XXX) of 10 November 1975."(A/46/L.47)

This draft resolution raises a question of principle regarding the extent and indeed the limit to which a session of the General Assembly can revoke or repeal a resolution or a decision adopted by it in a previous session and its ability to do so. Let me say that this is unprecedented except for one occasion that must be thought of as unique.

The draft resolution is replete with negative implications and ramifications for the gamut of all resolutions and decisions adopted by the General Assembly in previous sessions. The Chairman of the Arab Group has already touched upon that point at length. In the light of the foregoing, a very valid and logical case could be made - and indeed we make that point - that such revocations should be considered as an important question requiring a two-thirds majority vote within the purview of article 18, paragraph 2 of the Charter and rule 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

But my delegation is invoking neither that article nor that rule in order to avoid a lengthy discussion about whether the enumeration of important questions in both of them was intended to be exhaustive or illustrative.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

Accordingly, and for this reason only, my delegation formally proposes that the question of revocation be determined by the General Assembly as an additional category of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority. In other words, my delegation formally proposes that the draft resolution before us, contained in document A/46/L.47, require a two-thirds majority vote for adoption under rule 85 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Algeria to speak on a point of order.

Mr. AIT CHAALAL (Algeria) (interpretation from Arabic): My delegation supports the proposal just made by the delegate of Yemen, which is in keeping with the relevant articles in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly.

We consider that the revocation of a resolution that the General Assembly has already adopted is a very important question that requires that it be studied and adopted by a two-thirds majority, that is, two thirds of the Members present and voting.

(spoke in French)

We have just heard our eminent colleague, the Ambassador of Yemen, who raised the question of procedure concerning the importance of the subject we are now debating. I do not think, for a number of reasons, that one need insist much on the importance of this subject. First of all, the importance of the subject under consideration derives from the very fundamental principles of article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations, which reject any type of discrimination in any form whatsoever. The second element that confers particular importance to this subject is the fact that resolution 3379 (XXX), the revocation of which is being asked for today, was adopted in

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

1975 by the General Assembly of the United Nations after a long debate that was open to all parties present here, to all States, and that adoption was a majority decision by the Assembly. Therefore, to question that vote today is to put on trial the General Assembly itself, accusing it of either irresponsibility or lightheadedness.

I do not think that the dignity of the Assembly will ever allow it to accept such accusations. It took a decision in full knowledge of the facts and to this day nothing has come to light to prove that the reasons and the special conditions that led to that resolution's adoption have been eliminated.

Thus, we say that this resolution is still valid, in principle and in substance. I raise a question here: is there something new, either in ideological terms or in political terms or in daily practice? Are there any new elements that have corrected the conditions and the reasons that prompted the adoption of that resolution?

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

I would answer "No". I would even go farther. I would say that new factors have appeared, but this time they are more negative, because the situation has not improved but, on the contrary, has considerably worsened in the occupied Arab territories, especially in recent years, since the beginning of the intifadah.

The fourth reason is that the draft resolution introduced today seems to us to be untimely and dangerous. Why? Because it is disturbing a new climate, a climate which encouraged us to think that we had begun a dialogue, a negotiating phase, which could open up new prospects for the settlement of a Middle East conflict. Now, to raise the question in its present context at the very time when negotiating meetings are going on in Washington, has the effect of reviving a climate of confrontation and polemics at the very moment when we should be facilitating and encouraging the rapprochement of the parties to the conflict. Moreover - and I say this very frankly - I consider that to raise this problem in the context of today is a way of granting a prize for intransigence, obstinacy and refusal of open productive dialogue. I do not think that is the wish nor is it the goal of the sponsors of the draft resolution. That is why we are deeply disturbed and perplexed.

The fifth reason is that the draft resolution, should it be adopted, would be a precedent of extreme gravity because it runs the risk of questioning all the achievements of the international community and it would thus open the way to the dismantling of the United Nations system, of the United Nations edifice, so meticulously built up for almost half a century, and each one of us is very much aware of what that might mean in terms of a danger to world stability and to peace and international security.

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

If we really want resolution 3379 (XXX) to become inoperative, to become obsolete and of no further value, it will be up to Israel to fundamentally and totally reconsider its hegemonistic vision of the world and to renounce any form of superiority of one nation over another, of one people over another, of one State over another, or of one country over another. For that reason, Israel must reconsider the philosophic and doctrinal assertion that the State of Israel is a special State which is higher than other States. Here, I would quote what was said by Theodore Herzl, the father of Zionism. In his major work The Jewish State, he said: "The Jewish State in Palestine is a kind of avant-garde of civilization against barbarism". I leave it up to the General Assembly to judge the meaning of such a formula.

Therefore, Israel must reconsider its vision, its position in the Middle East, and its way of acting with its neighbouring States. Israel must also abrogate all the laws which in one way or another have a segregationist colour to them. I do not think that it is necessary to come back to these problems. The whole world knows of them and they know what happened, even two or three days ago, in the suburbs of Jerusalem. That is sufficient evidence.

Finally, we must put an end to the repressive policy, the repression, used by the Israeli State against the Palestinians, the repression which is contrary to the fundamental principles of the right of people to self-determination and to fundamental freedoms for all human beings on earth. We must, absolutely, achieve those results. Thus, if that were the case, if Israel were to take all those measures, then a universal consensus would arise by itself and the international community as a whole would agree to recognize that resolution 3379 (XXX) is now obsolete and, consequently, is really without any meaning. In that case I say that we would be among the first to applaud and to celebrate. Unfortunately now, that is not the case, and for

(Mr. Ait Chaalal, Algeria)

these reasons we request that draft resolution A/46/L.47 should require two-thirds majority.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Sudan who also wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. HASSAN (Sudan): My delegation supports the proposal submitted by the delegation of Yemen that the draft resolution in document A/46/L.47 requires a two-thirds majority vote for adoption. The reasons underlying our support are the following.

First, my delegation recognizes that the proposal was made under rule 85 and not 83 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly. My delegation concurs with that. Yet, the question of revocation of a previous resolution is in our view a very serious matter and requires careful attention and analysis. It should not be embarked upon without a thorough examination. It should not therefore be subject to distortion and pressure. Accordingly, it is not only an important question, but a very important one.

Secondly, revoking a previous resolution would set a very dangerous precedent fraught with adverse effects and ramifications, especially for the developing countries. If revocation is carried out easily by a simple majority, what guarantees do we have that other resolutions pertaining to development, apartheid and colonialism might not be revoked at some time in the future?

Thirdly, rule 81 of the rules of procedure provides for a two-thirds majority vote, at the same session, for the reconsideration of a resolution adopted at that session. There is nothing in that rule which indicates that it is restricted to one session and cannot therefore apply to a forthcoming session. Accordingly, if reconsideration at the same session is sufficiently

(Mr. Hassan, Sudan)

important to require a two-thirds majority, the same majority should be required for future consideration at a subsequent session, since the substance of consideration is the same.

Moreover, reconsideration involves various forms of changes, including adding, deleting, amending and revoking. Revocation, in our view, is the highest and most drastic of all those forms. Therefore, revoking a resolution should be the foremost among those that require a two-thirds majority.

For all these reasons, my delegation appeals to all other delegations to support the proposal made for requiring a two-thirds majority with respect to the draft resolution before us.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Uruguay, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. PIRIZ BALLON (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): We should refrain from delving into the substance of this question. As we see it, what is under discussion now is a procedural issue, and we shall therefore concentrate on explaining the reasons why my delegation opposes the motion that has been introduced.

There are two situations in which the United Nations can use the special two-thirds majority procedure. First, there is paragraph 2 of Article 18, which clearly stipulates the cases in which the procedure of adopting General Assembly resolutions by a special two-thirds majority of members present and voting shall apply. There are 10 categories of questions listed in paragraph 2 of Article 18. From an objective point of view, resolution A/46/L.47 does not fit into any of these categories, even if we interpret them broadly.

Paragraph 3 of Article 18, on the other hand, stipulates that other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting - in other words, a simple majority. The question arises whether draft resolution A/46/L.47 fits into this category. In our opinion, it clearly does not, for a number of reasons.

First is the question of the hierarchy of rules. For purposes of legal symmetry, the procedure followed for the repeal of a norm clearly must be the same as that followed for its adoption. This is a generally recognized principle, which applies in the absence of a special procedure. For that reason, we understand that if resolution 3379 (XXX) was adopted by a simple majority of members present and voting, the voting on the resolution revoking its content must pursue the same procedure. The criterion for determining the

(Mr. Piriz Ballon, Uruguay)

applicable majority that prevailed at the time of the adoption of resolution 3379 (XXX), in our opinion, was in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Charter. That is why we see no reason in this case to apply a different criterion.

Secondly, within that first category, if we consider precedents at the United Nations in terms of the revoking of resolutions, we find only one example: resolution 386 (V), which revokes provisions of resolution 39 (I). The revocation was done with a two-thirds majority. Far from militating in favour of the use of the special procedure in this case, the precedent to which I have referred bolsters the relevance of the simple majority, because in that case at least one of the requirements stipulated in Article 18 was met, since it was a recommendation directly linked to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The other option for using the two-thirds majority comes in rule 81 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, relating to the reconsideration of proposals adopted or rejected at the same session. Clearly, that is not the case in terms of resolution 3379 (XXX).

In the light of these objective procedural considerations, my delegation feels that the motion being presented has no validity. We urge members to follow the same criteron in determining that this draft resolution should be adopted on the basis of rule 85 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, which provides for a simple majority of members present and voting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Poland, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland): I would like to add my voice to the statement of my colleague from Uruguay, since we have been confronted with a procedural question, an answer to which can be found - as has been rightly pointed out - in the United Nations Charter, in the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, and in past practice.

Since the representative of Uruguay pointed out paragraph 2 of Article 18 of the Charter, I should like to recall the categories that are present there. They include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security; questions dealing with the composition of the United Nations, such as the election of members to Charter bodies; the admission of new Members; the suspension or expulsion of Members; questions relating to the operation of the Trusteeship System; and, finally, budgetary questions.

The issue which is before us today does not fall within their scope. This is strongly confirmed by the fact that, when resolution 3379 (XXX) was adopted by the General Assembly in 1975, a two-thirds majority vote was not required. It would be unjust and unreasonable to apply requirements to the draft resolution before us that quite correctly were not applied to resolution 3379 (XXX).

I do not expect that anybody will have the slightest doubt as to the significance of the question under consideration today. Here I hope we are all in agreement. After all the General Assembly, in this very Hall, does not deal with unimportant questions. Permit me to remind delegations that at this session of the General Assembly action has already been taken on the overthrow of the legitimate Government of Haiti, the convening of an international conference on the Middle East, the question of Palestine, and the need for a comprehensive test ban that would outlaw nuclear testing in all environments for all time.

(Mr. Mroziewicz, Poland)

All those items were considered under the normal simple-majority procedure. Despite their obvious significance, no one sought to have them declared important questions. The many draft resolutions the General Assembly adopts under this item, "Elimination of racism and racial discrimination" - an issue of undoubted significance - are regularly considered under the simple-majority voting procedure.

I agree with the previous speaker that rule 81 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly very clearly requires that a proposal be reconsidered "at the same session" for it to require a two-thirds majority. That is not the case today.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that at this stage there is no legal basis, either in the Charter or the rules of procedure or in practice, which would justify the application of a two-thirds majority vote to the issue before us. We propose that the issue be decided by a simple majority of members present and voting.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will take a decision on the motion by which draft resolution A/46/L.47 would be considered to fall within the category of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority. Rule 85 of the rules of procedure applies to the Assembly's decision on the proposal before it. That rule reads as follows:

"Decisions of the General Assembly on questions other than those provided for in rule 83, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting".

(The President)

I now put to the vote the motion by the representative of Yemen that the decision on draft resolution A/46/L.47 requires a two-thirds majority. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen

Against: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Canada, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire

Abstaining: Angola, Cameroon, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ghana, India, Lesotho, Mauritius, Myanmar, Namibia, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe

The motion was rejected by 96 votes to 34, with 13 abstentions.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The decision on draft resolution A/46/L.47 will therefore be taken by a simple majority.

I wish to announce that the following delegations have become sponsors of the draft resolution: Belarus, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Cyprus, Gambia, Grenada, Guyana, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Singapore, Suriname, Swaziland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/46/L.47. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen

Abstaining: Angola, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mauritius, Myanmar, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

The draft resolution was adopted by 111 votes to 25, with 13 abstentions (resolution 46/86).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): For reasons of principle, my country is categorically opposed to any doctrine or practice that denies the fundamental rights of any people or nation or that involves discrimination against any culture or any ethnic or religious group.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

This attitude applies to the Hebrew people, which throughout history has been a victim of discrimination, and which in the fairly recent time of Nazism was the target of the most horrendous attempt at extermination. It applies also to the Palestinian people, which has been stripped of its land, and against which brutal forms of oppression and discrimination are being applied.

The rejection of any form of hostility or persecution based on prejudices or discriminatory attitudes against any human group is assuming inescapable importance. It is becoming an ethical imperative in the light of mounting and alarming manifestations of racism and anti-semitism, which now occur so very frequently in Europe and the United States, with repulsive impunity. Now - at a time when expressions of the basest chauvinism are reappearing; when some are openly proclaiming racial and national hatred as a policy; when swastikas and flaming crosses are making a renewed appearance, as is evidenced by devastated synagogues; when old-style and new-style Fascists assemble and demonstrate the sordid essence of their "new order" - condemnation of anti-semitism and any other form of discrimination is not only a fundamental political responsibility but also an unavoidable moral duty.

Without wavering in any way in its support of these beliefs, my delegation has none the less found itself obliged to vote against the draft resolution. Notwithstanding certain indications to the contrary, the General Assembly was presented with a text dealing with a delicate issue without that text's first having been submitted to the Third Committee, which has already completed its work. Submission of the text to the Third Committee would have made possible a more measured and thorough consideration.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

My delegation firmly believes that the United Nations must act consistently if it is to achieve a just, complete and lasting solution to the conflict of the Middle East on the basis of the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the resolutions adopted by the Security Council - a solution that will enable all the peoples of the region to live in peace and to exercise their national rights fully.

One does not need to scrutinize the history books in order to verify the moral duplicity that has made it impossible for this Organization to do justice to the Palestinian people. There is an endless list of General Assembly resolutions that have been ignored, and it would be tedious to describe the way in which action that could have been taken by the Security Council has been avoided because the Council has been systematically paralysed. All of which has placed the Palestinian people in a profoundly unjust situation and has aggravated the Middle East conflict.

Between 1975 and last year 17 General Assembly resolutions and 17 Security Council resolutions - all of them related to the situation of the Palestinian people and violations of their rights by the Israeli authorities - have been ignored. The failure to implement those resolutions stands as the best testimony to the inconsistency of this Organization.

Therefore, apart from any consideration that might arise in respect of the implications of General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX), the text of the resolution that has just been adopted - a text submitted by the United States - will be harmful to the cause of peace and justice in the Middle East. It introduces a distorting factor into any genuine effort at negotiation and is an affront to the Palestinian people, which has been the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

victim of systematic, cruel, repressive and discriminatory practices. In fact, with the resolution that has just been adopted, the General Assembly - far from reconsidering an issue that, in any case, would require calm and thorough analysis - is taking this Organization one more step along a road that will increasingly lead to its coming under the rule of the Government of the United States and force it to march to the tune of Washington. The United States has taken this initiative for petty domestic reasons and with other considerations in mind, using a level of pressure and disinformation that is quite extraordinary.

These considerations and our solidarity with the Palestinian people were the grounds for my delegation's negative vote.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (India): India voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/46/L.47 in the hope and expectation that an obstacle in the path to peace in west Asia would be removed and that the way would be cleared for the United Nations to play a more active role in the peace process. We believe that no conceptual theories should be allowed to stand in the way of peace.

For India, consistent support of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people is an article of faith. We have stood firm in our position that it is imperative that Israel withdraw from the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem.

(Mr. Gharekhan, India)

We have accorded diplomatic recognition to the State of Palestine and it is our firm belief that without a just and comprehensive settlement of the question of Palestine there can be no lasting peace and stability for the countries of the region. Our vote today does not in any way detract from the principled support we have extended to the Palestinian cause.

The current peace process has made a beginning, however modest, towards the solution of the intricate problems of West Asia. The fact that the General Assembly has given its support to the present draft resolution in such a convincing manner is conclusive evidence of the international community's ardent desire for peace in that much-troubled region. Israel must not interpret today's vote as the slightest dilution of the international community's support for the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, including a homeland of their own. Israel must withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and live in peace with its Arab neighbours.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 92.

The Assembly will now consider the report (A/46/719) of the Third Committee on agenda item 93, entitled "Right of peoples to self-determination".

The Assembly will take decisions on the three draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 21 of its report. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again be given an opportunity to explain their votes.

The Assembly will first take a decision on draft resolution I, entitled "Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to

(The President)

self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Albania, Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Panama, Poland, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Austria, Belarus, Costa Rica, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Spain, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Uruguay

Draft resolution I was adopted by 113 votes to 22, with 24 abstentions (resolution 46/87).*

---

* Subsequently, the delegation of Djibouti advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of Latvia and Paraguay had intended to abstain.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution II, entitled "Universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination".

The Third Committee adopted draft resolution II without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/88).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Finally, we turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Use of mercenaries as a means to violate human rights and to impede the exercise of the right of peoples to self-determination". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, France, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution III was adopted by 122 votes to 11, with 28 abstentions (resolution 46/89).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of Argentina, who wishes to explain his vote.

Mr. NIETO (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to explain the Argentine delegation's vote on draft resolution I, "Importance of the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples for the effective guarantee and observance of human rights".

While the Argentine Republic has firmly supported and continues to support in all the relevant international and regional forums, the principle of self-determination and its international framework - resolution 1520 (XV) - we voted against draft resolution I because it contains unbalanced language which is the result of the injection of cold-war words into the international scene. Specifically, the language about South Africa does not take into account recent developments in that country and the language pertaining to the Palestinian problem makes no reference at all to the meetings of the Middle East peace conference held recently.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has concluded its consideration of agenda item 93.

The Assembly will now consider part I of the report (A/46/704 and Corr.1 and 2) of the Third Committee on agenda item 94 (a), entitled "Social

development: questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family".

I call on the representative of Mongolia.

Mr. ERDENECHULUUN (Mongolia): My delegation wishes to draw the attention of members to the following technical change that is to be made in operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution IV, entitled "International Literacy Year", contained in document A/46/704 and Corr.1 and 2 under agenda item 94 (a), "Social development: questions relating to the world social situation and to youth, ageing, disabled persons and the family": The existing operative paragraph 8 should be replaced by a new paragraph reading as follows:

"Decides to discuss the question of 'Progress made and problems encountered in the struggle against illiteracy: a mid-decade review' at its fiftieth session under the item 'Social development'."

This change is in conformity with the rationalization of the work of the Third Committee that has been undertaken during the past two sessions of the General Assembly. I hope it will not pose any problems for any delegation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has before it seven draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 28 of its report (A/46/704 and Corr.1 and 2) and a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 29 of the same document, together with the amendment just read out by the representative of Mongolia.

The Assembly will first take decisions on the seven draft resolutions.

Draft resolution I is entitled "Monitoring of international plans and programmes of action in the field of social development". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/90).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution II is entitled "Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Ageing and related activities". Draft resolution II was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/91).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution III is entitled "Preparation for and observance of the International Year of the Family". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/92).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution IV is entitled "International Literacy Year". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt it, as orally revised?

Draft resolution IV, as orally revised, was adopted (resolution 46/93).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution V is entitled "Implementation of the International Plan of Action on Ageing: integration of the elderly in development". The Third Committee adopted draft resolution V without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution V was adopted (resolution 46/94).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution VI is entitled "World social situation".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname,

Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belgium, Germany, Israel, Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 157 to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 46/95).*

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution VII is entitled "Implementation of the World Programme of Action concerning Disabled Persons and the United Nations Decade of Disabled Persons". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution VII was adopted (resolution 46/96).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 29 of its report (A/704 and Corr.1 and 2). The draft decision is entitled "Documents relating to social development". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of sub-item (a) of agenda item 94.

We shall now consider the report (A/46/653) of the Third Committee on agenda item 95, entitled "Advancement of Women".

---

* Subsequently the delegation of Latvia advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.

(The President)

The Assembly has before it four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 17 of its report and a draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 18 of the same document. The Assembly will first take decisions on the four draft resolutions.

Draft resolution I is entitled "United Nations Development Fund for Women". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/97).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution II is entitled " Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/98).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution III entitled "International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women". The draft resolution was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/99).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution IV is entitled "Improvement of the status of women in the Secretariat". The Third Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 46/100).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision entitled "Reports considered under the item entitled 'Advancement of Women'". The Third Committee adopted the draft decision without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to make a statement in explanation of his delegation's position.

Mr. MARKS (United States of America): The Government of the United States joined the consensus on the adoption of the resolution entitled "Implementation of the Nairobi Forward-looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women". However, we should like to explain our position with respect to operative paragraph 7 of that resolution.

While we are indeed understanding of the burden that debt repayments place on developing economies, we cannot agree that this is the sole cause of economic difficulties in these economies. Many problems are caused by national policies that prevent open markets from operating efficiently and by policies that have resulted in substantial internal debts. We wish to be very clear that we are working closely with the international community on a strengthened debt strategy. We have moved quickly to forgive well over $3 billion of official debt for the low-income countries that have undertaken structural adjustment programmes. But we cannot agree that, as this paragraph would have us believe, all economic problems faced by these countries are the result of external debt.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 95.

The Assembly will consider the report (A/46/720 and Corr.1) of the Third Committee on agenda item 96, "Narcotic drugs".

The Assembly will take decisions on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 16 of its report.

Draft resolution I, entitled "Respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and international law in the fight against drug

(The President)

abuse and illicit trafficking", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/101).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution II is entitled "Implementation of the Global Programme of Action against illicit production, supply, demand, trafficking and distribution of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances". The Third Committee adopted this draft resolution without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/102).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution III, entitled "International action to combat drug abuse and illicit trafficking", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/103).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution IV, entitled "United Nations International Drug Control Programme", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 46/104).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We have concluded our consideration of agenda item 96.

(The President)

The Assembly will consider next the report (A/46/705) of the Third Committee on agenda item 97, "Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions".

The Assembly will now take decisions on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 18 of its report and on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 19 of that report.

We shall first take decisions on the four draft resolutions contained in paragraph 18 of the report.

Draft resolution I, entitled "Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees", was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 46/105).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution II is entitled "Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees". The Third Committee adopted it without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution II was adopted (resolution 46/106).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): We now turn to draft resolution III, entitled "International Conference on Central American Refugees", which was adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 46/107).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): Draft resolution IV is entitled "Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa". It was also adopted by the Third Committee without a vote.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IV was adopted (resolution 46/108).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft decision recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 19 of its report.

May I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt the draft decision?

The draft decision was adopted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Spanish): That concludes our consideration of agenda item 97.

The meeting rose at 5 p.m.